```
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
1
                             DISTRICT OF NEVADA
2
 3
                              LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
      In re: USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE )
                                           E-Filed: 06/01/09
 4
      COMPANY,
 5
                                        )
                Debtor.
                                           Case No.
 6
                                           BK-S-06-10725-LBR
                                           Chapter 11
 7
8
9
10
11
                     PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
                                     OF
12
                               JUDGE'S RULING
                                     ON
13
                             SHOW CAUSE HEARING
                   WHY CURTIS F. CLARK HAS NOT VIOLATED
             FEDERAL BANKRUPTCY RULES 9011 AND 9018, NO. 7109
14
                                  VOLUME 1
15
                   BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRUCE A. MARKELL
                      UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
16
                           Friday, May 29, 2009
17
                                  9:30 a.m.
18
19
20
21
22
23
      Court Recorder: Helen C. Smith
2.4
      Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;
25
      transcript produced by transcription service.
```

```
APPEARANCES:
 1
 2
      For Curtis F. Clark:
                              MATTHEW Q. CALLISTER, ESQ.
                              MATTHEW P. PAWLOWSKI, ESQ.
 3
                              Callister & Reynolds
                              823 Las Vegas Boulevard South
 4
                              Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
 5
      For the USACM
                              ROB CHARLES, JR., ESQ.
      Liquidating Trust:
                              Lewis and Roca, LLP
                              3993 Howard Hughes Parkway
 6
                              Suite 600
 7
                              Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
 8
      Also Present:
                              CURTIS F. CLARK
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
(Court previously convened at 09:34:09 a.m.)
1
            (Partial transcript at 10:12:15 a.m.)
 2
                THE COURT: All right. Let me rule now.
      These will constitute my findings of fact and conclusions of
 4
 5
      law. I do not intend to write anything further on this.
           A couple of things, and then let me just kind of go in
      order. I think today there's a concession by Mr. Clark through
      his attorney that what was submitted and what's been admitted
 8
9
      into evidence as Document 6183, Pleading 6183, did, in fact,
      violate Rule 9011 and 9018.
10
11
           Thus, the focus, really, of the hearing today for me was
      whether or not there was sufficient cause to refer this to the
12
      district court as I have to under Dyre (phonetic) for purposes
13
      of conducting further investigations with respect to whether it
14
      was criminal and, thus, would result in, presumably, a trial in
15
16
      district court on that merit.
17
           Let me start backwards because I think there are
18
      violations of Rule 9011, 9018, and the possible criminal
      referral, also potential violations under the inherent power of
19
      the Court.
20
           I have decided not to refer the matter as a criminal
21
22
      matter. I think and believe that it would be difficult to
23
      establish the requisite criminal intent under United States
24
      versus Kirk and United States versus Thoreen, 641 F .2d 684 and
```

653 F .2d 1332, and the more recent cases of U.S. versus Doe,

25

```
125 F .3d 1249, and Federal Trade Commission versus American National Cellular, 868 \ F .2d 315.
```

2.2

Although their disagreement between my understanding of the case isn't what counsel has put forward in the pleadings, I do believe that Mr. Clark was animated by frustration.

That doesn't excuse it. That simply indicates I think the criminal intent, the mens rea, would be difficult to prove.

And at that point, you know, further attention to this I think magnifies and republishes if you will the scandalous and horrid things that were said. And at some point, it has to come to an end.

There's a story about Mr. Justice Holmes who is actually one of the first Supreme Court justices to actually use law clerks that one day he and (indiscernible) used to have a habit of walking at lunch.

That one day he was walking at lunch with one of his clerks, and he came to a railroad trestle, one of those types of things that indicates the end of the tracks, and he says, son, salute that, and the clerk saluted first and asked later why.

Mr. Justice Holmes said there are very few things in this life that come to an end. And when you see them, they're deserving of respect. I would like this to come to an end.

To that end, as I said, I do not think a criminal referral

is warranted under the facts, although there may have been criminal contempt, but I don't think that it rises to the level that I would send it to the district court.

That being said, I think the sanctions that flow civilly are probably more than or somewhat more than what has been indicated here.

First, let me start with some of the easy ones. First, I will order the pleading stricken -- that's Document No. 6183 -- and taken off the record of the court or taken off the docket of the court.

Second, as a combined sanction both under Rule 9018 and 9011, I am going to adopt counsel's suggestion that Mr. Clark vet through me instead of Judge Riegle any pleadings that he intends to file in any of the USA Commercial Mortgage cases which is pretty standard. That vetting would be simply for the language that is being used.

I do not want and will not censor in the sense of the substantive statements that he wishes to make simply the characterizations as we have talked about today, hyperbole or what have you.

We're here I think not because Mr. Clark is upset with the process, but we're here because Mr. Clark expressed that in ways that are unacceptable in any civil society, so I will simply vet that, and vet it at a pretty low standard.

That is to say I certainly do not want to squelch a desire

2.2

to indicate a displeasure with the process if appropriate or a proposed action if appropriate, but I think as I said in my order to show cause something that exceeds the bounds of advocacy will not be permitted.

MR. CALLISTER: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: That also not only will extend to Mr. Clark, but to any group or subgroup which purports to represent the interest of Mr. Clark.

That is to say it would be too easy to evade the court order by simply having the statements moved to someone else who purports to represent him formally or informally. Now this may cause problems.

I understand that they're (indiscernible), and this is prompted by the fact that in his declaration which I have taken and read that he says he's a member of a very large group of unsecured creditors and who have sought from the outset of this case to recover any sums possible that to the extent that any formal or informal grouping exists of which Mr. Clark is a member. As he states in his declaration, this prefiling injunction will extend.

Now, if there's any question, obviously, they can say we don't represent Mr. Clark. And in which case, he doesn't pick up the benefit of that representation, so much the better in the sense of that would form a part of the sanction here.

You will not be able to join a member of the group if they

```
1
      don't want to take on the disabilities that I am putting on him
 2
      here.
           I also don't want to review everything that's filed in
      USACM. Although if they want to represent Mr. Clark under
 5
      those circumstances, I will be able to do so.
           Also, I will add that there will be absolutely no
 6
      extensions of any time deadlines because of this requirement.
      That means that it will have to be done in advance.
 8
 9
                MR. CALLISTER: I understand, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Mr. Charles.
10
                MR. CHARLES: We have not worked through almost
11
      200,000,000 or -- no. I'm sorry -- almost 400,000,000 of
12
      claims.
13
14
           I'm pretty sure Mr. Clark's secured claim is in a pot that
      at some point we have to figure out, and we will work with
15
16
      Mr. Clark if we object to the claim, so that he's not
17
      prejudiced by that.
18
           But I'm also not going to be in a situation where he
      couldn't file a response to a claim objection because he gets
19
      caught up in an omnibus, so we'll make every effort to avoid
20
21
      any prejudice to Mr. Clark in that regard if that's all right
2.2
      with you.
                THE COURT: How could I object to you not working so
23
24
      as to avoid any prejudice to Mr. Clark?
25
                MR. CHARLES: I understand.
```

```
MR. CALLISTER: I was waiting to see what the
1
      objection was.
 2
                THE COURT: All right. So, point 1, strike the
      pleading. Point 2, the prevetting process. Point 3 is one
 5
      that I'm going to add that has not been mentioned in the papers
      thus far, and it links to point 2.
 6
           Within the next six months, I want Mr. Clark to take a
      class in civil discourse. This is prompted by paragraph 32 of
 8
9
      his declaration that says, "Declarant" -- meaning Mr. Clark --
10
      "should be educated about his mistakes specifically as to what
11
      language is and is not permitted in court-filed pleadings."
           I would ask that as his attorney or whatever you submit to
12
      me, you know, three potential courses he will take within the
13
      next -- I'm looking for something that's at least an hour if
14
15
      not more.
16
                MR. CALLISTER: Okay.
17
                THE COURT: As a former educator, I think education
18
      does work. And, in fact --
                MR. CALLISTER: And this was in civil discourse,
19
20
      your Honor?
                THE COURT: Well, civil discourse or permitted
21
22
      discourse if you will, civil as opposed to uncivil --
                MR. CALLISTER: I understand.
23
24
                THE COURT: -- discourse. My own preliminary
25
      research indicates that there are probably a number of such
```

```
1 programs out there that are available.
```

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

That's why I say, you know, within the next month I would ask that you submit a list of three or more to me, and I'll approve those, so that he knows that it's approved before he attends.

And once that class is completed -- and I would ask him to submit evidence of that.

MR. CALLISTER: Um-h'm.

THE COURT: And I would link that to point 2. That is once that class is completed I will remove the restriction with respect to prefiling pleadings.

MR. CALLISTER: We appreciate that.

THE COURT: I will also indicate that if, in fact, that's removed and he resumes the activity here I would not hesitate to immediately send out across the street for purposes of criminal prosecution.

MR. CALLISTER: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: In essence, I take Mr. Clark as a gruff person used to rougher discourse than we see in court pleadings, and, I mean, I think what he did was objectionable, more than objectionable.

I don't think it rises to the level of criminal because as you have pointed out in your papers I'm very desirous of protecting of the First Amendment.

But at the same point, there are limits. For example, as

2.2

I indicated when he first got on the stand, the First Amendment doesn't protect you in court from perjury.

Similarly, if Mr. Clark did not like a particular candidate in a political election, he couldn't spray-paint over the person's name when he walked into the ballot box.

There are limitations on the ways in which people can express their displeasure with the system but, yet, still work within it, and I think the three items that I have proposed I think actually put a significant restriction on Mr. Clark.

But, also, in the words of 9011, it is supposed to be a sanction that not only acts as a deterrent to Mr. Clark's future transgressions, but the people similarly situated.

And in this case, striking the pleading, putting a prefiling requirement in until such time as some mandatory education has been completed, hopefully, will send the message that the bankruptcy court is a court that will listen to all complaints, but the complaints have to be formed in a way in which they're within the reasonable bounds of advocacy.

The fourth thing I would add -- and this is I think more easy to comply with, but I think, hopefully, it is responsive to some of Mr. Clark's concerns -- I would also like a report within a month as to what steps he's taken to express his displeasure at the system.

If, in fact, his comments indicate that he had concerns with the actions of professionals or the Court, I take it today

2.2

that he felt that those were futile. I don't think they are. I hope they're not.

But I would like him to tell me what actions he's taken to pursue his complaints in other forums because most of what he complains about is, quite frankly, something, historically, bankruptcy has always been the subject of.

You can go back to hearings in the 1930s and earlier in terms of fees in professional cases. Congress held hearings in the '30s and in the early and mid '30s about how much money in bankruptcy was going to the professionals and not to the creditors.

It is, unfortunately, a bad circumstance in that sometimes it takes a lot of money to figure out what's gone wrong. I understand it. I think most of the professionals in the system understand that, but, perhaps, Mr. Clark has not.

And if he pursues the other avenues that are available to him, perhaps, he will come to a better understanding of the system.

And it may be that I will never be able to change

Mr. Clark's mind on that, but I certainly think he should

pursue those avenues if he thinks he has been truly wronged.

And that's a measure of good faith on my part that what has been done, his lashing out, was a measure of frustration at the system and not a personal attack. If that's true, pursue those avenues. Don't lash out again.

```
So with those four things as sanctions for the violations
1
      of 9011 and 9018 with an indication I will not refer the matter
 2
      for criminal proceedings, I believe I am ready to conclude the
      hearing, but I would appreciate it if you have any questions as
 5
      to what Mr. Clark has to do. I could answer --
                MR. CALLISTER: Well, I think --
 6
                THE COURT: -- those now.
                MR. CALLISTER: -- I understand, your Honor. Is the
 8
9
      Court going to craft or am I to do so based on the --
                THE COURT: Well, what I would propose to do is I
10
      will order the transcript of today's hearing.
11
12
                MR. CALLISTER: Thank you.
                THE COURT: I will enter an order. The Court will
13
14
      enter an order that says for the reasons and stated on the
      record the order on the record is a permanent order, and we'll
15
16
      enter that, so --
17
                MR. CALLISTER: Thank you.
18
                THE COURT: So that no one has to kind of go back
      because I understand that what I have done is somewhat vague in
19
20
      some --
                MR. CALLISTER: Well, I --
21
2.2
                THE COURT: -- of the circumstances.
23
                MR. CALLISTER: I think I understand, your Honor.
24
                THE COURT: Well, it's intentionally vague because I
25
      have no idea what type of educational class he will take, and I
```

```
mean to leave that open in terms of -- I mean, and part of the
 1
 2
      sanction is having him think through what he really wants to
 3
      do.
                MR. CALLISTER: You bet.
 5
                THE COURT: And so I think we'll simply do it that
      way, and I'll enter an order on the transcript, and what I said
 6
      is what I've said.
 8
                MR. CALLISTER: Thank you, your Honor.
 9
                THE COURT: All right.
                MR. CALLISTER: I have nothing further.
10
11
                THE COURT: Is there anything further from anyone?
      All right.
12
           Then we're adjourned.
13
                MR. CALLISTER: Thank you, your Honor.
14
15
                THE CLERK: All rise.
16
                MR. CALLISTER: Thank you for the Court's time.
17
           (Court concluded at 10:28:13 a.m.)
18
19
20
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

```
1
           I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
 2
       from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in
 3
       the above-entitled matter.
 4
 5
       /s/ Michele Phelps
                                                  06/01/09
       Michele Phelps, Transcriptionist
                                                    Date
 8
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```